DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 441 24 AC 010 467

AUTHOR Valencia, Atilano A.
TITLE Oral English Development among Non-English Speaking, Spanish-Speaking American Adults Based on Thirty Innovative Video Programs and Related Paper/Pencil Lessons.
INSTITUTION Southwestern Cooperative Educational Lab., Albuquerque, N. Mex.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO BR-6-2827
PUB DATE 71
CONTRACT OEC-2-7-005081-5081
NOTE 69p.; A Field Testing Report for the Adult Basic Education Division, Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Programs, Educational Research, *English (Second Language), *Language Instruction, Oral English, *Spanish Speaking, Statistical Analysis, *Televised Instruction
IDENTIFIERS Empleen Ingles Series

ABSTRACT

The 1970-1971 field testing of the Adult Basic Education Empleen Ingles video programs and paper and pencil lessons was undertaken to provide answers to several questions. These questions concerned: (1) the instructional effectiveness of the 30 video programs and pen and pencil lessons; (2) the two programs as single or dual instructional media; (3) target population attitudes toward English usage and video program characters; and (4) learning retention among program participants subsequent to a time period following the final program exposure. Findings of the field testing show: (1) the Empleen Ingles Video Program and Paper/Pencil Lessons produce dramatic and significant gains in English comprehension, usage, and vocabulary; (2) a combination of the programs produce greater learning effects than does a single instructional medium; (3) the target population perceived the video program in a favorable light; and (4) the degree of English proficiency 20 days after program exposure remained significantly higher as compared with pretest scores. It is recommended that: (1) a dissemination plan be conceptualized and implemented to provide the target population with these instructional programs; and (2) consideration be given to continuing the development of the Empleen Ingles series until 100 or 150 video programs have been completed. (DB)

This publication is issued pursuant to terms of Contract No. OEC-2-7-005081-5081 with the Bureau of Research Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The views and findings stated herein are not necessarily those of the U. S. Office of Education, and no endorsement is stated or implied.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ORAL ENGLISH DEVELOPMENT AMONG NON-ENGLISH SPEAKING, SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICAN ADULTS BASED ON THIRTY INNOVATIVE VIDEO PROGRAMS AND RELATED PAPER/PENCIL LESSONS

A Field Testing Report

for the Adult Basic Education Division,

Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory

by

Atilano A. Valencia, Director

Related Programs for Mexican Americans

Southwestern Cooperative Educational

Laboratory, Inc.

Albuquerque, New Mexico

June 1971

PREFACE

The 1970-71 field testing of the Adult Basic Education Empleen Ingles video programs and paper and pencil lessons was undertaken by the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory Division, Related Programs for Mexican Americans, in August 1970 through June 1971. Dr. Atilano A. Valencia, Director of Related Programs for Mexican Americans, coordinated the field testing program and was responsible in formulating the research design, statistical analyses design, interpreting and composing the following report. Mr. Tony Galaz, Research Assistant, Related Programs for Mexican Americans, served as a coordinator in the testing activities, provided assistance in the design of the video and paper and pencil test instruments, in the pilot testing of the instruments and training the field testors. Mr. Richard Lentz, SWCEL Data Processing Manager, extended assistance in supervising the preparation and processing of the data through computer analyses. And Mrs. Linda Korka, Computer Programmer, worked directly with Mr. Lentz in the computer processing of the data.

Acknowledgment

A note of appreciation is extended to Mr. J. C. Sondheim, KFRE station manager, Fresno, California, for providing station facilities in telecasting the thirty Empleen Ingles programs on a community service basis. In addition to the telecasting of the programs, the station provided wide coverage and publicity relative to the video programs.

A note of appreciation also is expressed to Mr. Carlos Gonzales, Financial Aid Counselor, Fresno City College and Mr. John Martinez, Staff member at the West Texas Educational Center in Midland, Texas. Mr. Gonzales undertook the responsibility of serving as area coordinator, providing supervision of the testing and collecting of data by five field testors in the Fresno area. And Mr. Martinez recruited the participation of twenty-four non-English speaking Mexican American adults to attend classes where the paper and pencil materials were provided. Additionally, Mr. Martinez enlisted the services of a classroom tutor to assist the participants with the comprehension of the content in the paper and pencil lessons.

The Laboratory also is appreciative for the time extended by the student participants, teachers, testors and consultants in the field. This study would not have been possible without the services extended by all of the aforementioned people and agencies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	i
Acknowledgment	ii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. RESEARCH DESIGN	5
Treatment Conditions and Geographical Settings	5
Test Instruments and Independent Variables	6
Field Testing Team Selection and Training	8
Field Testing Design	8
Statistical Analyses Design	9
III. STATISTICAL ANALYSES AND FINDINGS	10
Experimental Group Achievement in Oral English Based on Analysis of Variance and Percentage Gain or Loss, Using the Paper/pencil Test Instrument	10
Experimental Group Achievement in Oral English Based on Analysis of Variance and Percentage Gain or Loss, Using the Video Test Instrument	11
Experimental Group Learning Retention in Oral English Based on Analysis of Variance and Percentage Gain or Loss	21
Attitudinal Change Relative to Oral English Usage Based on Analysis of Variance and Percentage Gain or Loss	27
Attitudinal Factor Relative to Video Program Characters and Situations Based on Analysis of Variance, Using the Video Test Instrument	27
Attitudinal Factor Relative to Cultural, Acting, Musical, Dancing, and Repetitive Voice Features, Using the Video Test Instrument	28
Experimental Group Differences in Oral English Achievement Based on Analysis of Covariance, Using the Video Test Instrument	36
Experimental Group Differences in Oral English Achievement Based on Analysis of Covariance, Using the Paper/pencil Test Instrument	37

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

	Page
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	44
Appendices	51
Appendix A: Treatment Group Attrition Data	52
Appendix B: Sample pages from the Video Instrument	54
Appendix C: Sample pages from the Paper/pencil Test Instrument	61

I. INTRODUCTION

The 1970-71 field testing of thirty video ESL programs, developed by the University of Arizona, Radio-TV Bureau, under sub-contractual basis with the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, was primarily a Laboratory undertaking. However, the total testing program would not have been possible without the cooperation of individuals and other agencies from other geographical areas.

Field testing of the SWCEL Empleen Ingles series has been carried over a three year period. The first field testing plan included five television video lessons. Three testing conditions were used: a classroom condition with video exposure, a classroom condition with video exposure and follow-up drills conducted by a teacher, and a home condition with video exposure and no followup drills.

The sampling population included non-English speaking, Spanish-speaking adults (age 18-65) from six geographical areas. The primary purpose was to test the effectiveness of English oral language instruction (language usage and comprehension development), using an innovating instructional scheme (e.g., animation, choreography, and other entertaining elements) via television.

The 1968-69 field testing results show significant gains in oral English usage and comprehension based on the test instrument and research design designed by SWCEL staff. There was no significant difference between the home treatment condition and the classroom condition. Consequently, it was concluded that the home treatment condition was advantageous in terms of cost. It was recommended that further field testing of the video program be undertaken to ascertain their instructional effectiveness over a longer treatment

exposure (e.g., fifteen video programs) and over a more distributed time base. It was further recommended that the effectiveness of the program be tested with other Spanish speaking ethnic groups, such as the Cuban population in Miami and the Puerto Rican population in New York City. Additionally, it was suggested that an attitudinal component be included in the testing to obtain data on target population attitudes toward the characters depicted in the video program.

The 1969-70 field testing scheme was designed to determine the instructional effectiveness of fifteen oral English video programs among rural adult Mexican Americans in two different geographical areas and time arrangements, and urban Cuban and Puerto Rican adults.

Only one treatment condition was used in the field testing program--the home setting. However, a distributed time base versus a consecutive program series was compared. Since fifteen video lessons were tested, the programs were presented on a three consecutive week series, excluding weekends, in four locations. The distributed time arrangement (Monday, Wednesday, and Friday) was presented over a five-week period, excluding weekends, in one of the five geographical areas. Thus, it was possible to make a comparison between two urban Mexican American populations, one using a consecutive time arrangement and the other a distributed time base.

The 1969-70 field testing results show significant gains in English comprehension and usage across all experimental groups except one. The statistical findings show the combined population means at or beyond 50 percent in relationship to the total correct responses possible on English comprehension and usage; yet, in terms of these means, the overall achievement

did not reach the 85 percent score predicted in one of the research hypotheses. This suggests that most of the learners scored relatively low at the beginning and advanced significantly in the program; however, this achievement was not sufficiently high to measure 85 percent on the post-test.

The 1969-70 findings also show a consistent and favorable attitude among the six population groups toward the video program characters. With a mean of 8.80 (possible maximum score is ten) across the six experimental groups, the data show that positive perceptions toward program characters far exceeded the 50 percent predicted in the research hypothesis.

A comparative analysis revealed no significant differences between the population groups, except in reference to one of the geographical areas--Santa Maria, California. Further study is needed to determine the lower achievement of this group as compared to the others.

Additionally, no significant difference was found between the distributed-time plan and the consecutive-time arrangement, but it is noteworthy that the most dramatic gain in English comprehension and usage occurred in Denver, where the distributed-time plan was used. Because of the difficulty in finding "prime-time" for telecasting programs, the foregoing finding can have important implications in selecting time arrangements for presenting the Empleen Ingles series. The distributed time arrangement presents unique advantages in terms of feasibility for telecasting the video programs.

During 1969-70, the West Texas Education Center in Midland, Texas, completed a package of paper and pencil materials that can be utilized with non-English speaking, (literate or illiterate) Spanish-speaking adults. These lessons are related to the video programs and, therefore, are designed to serve as a supplement or reinforcement medium. With thirty video programs

and related paper and pencil lessons available in 1970, several questions needed to be answered:

1. Do the video programs maintain their instructional effectiveness when the number of exposures is doubled (15 to 30)?
2. Do the video programs tend to maintain their audience when the exposure time is doubled?
3. Do the attitudes of the participants toward the program characters and the instructional media tend to vary and change (positively or negatively) over a longer period of exposure?
4. Does the inclusion of paper and pencil materials (coupled with the video programs) tend to enhance learning English significantly as compared to the single medium, video only, exposure?
5. On the average, do the learners tend to retain the learned verbal patterns after instruction has been discontinued (e.g., over a four week period)?

II. RESEARCH AND DESIGN

Treatment Conditions and Geographical Settings

Based on the questions presented in the foregoing section, the following treatment conditions were conceptualized:

Treatment Condition I: Utilizing the video programs without paper and pencil materials and teacher aides.

Treatment Condition II: Utilizing home-video instruction with paper and pencil materials, excluding teacher aides.

Treatment Condition III: Utilizing home-video instruction with paper and pencil materials, including fifth grade level students as teacher aides.

Treatment Condition IV: Utilizing only the paper and pencil materials in a classroom setting, coupled with a teacher aide.

Twenty to twenty-five non-English speaking, Spanish-speaking Mexican Americans were randomly selected as subjects per treatment condition in two geographical areas. Initially, it was suggested that all of the treatment conditions would be included in two different geographical areas. However, because of the increased number of video programs as compared to previous years much difficulty was experienced in enlisting the services of television stations on a community service basis. Television stations usually plan their schedules several months in advance. Thus, while time was offered by several stations in different geographical areas, only one was able to provide time within our field testing schedule. KFRE, Fresno, California extended thirty days of telecasting time to accommodate our field testing plan, while, at the same time, it also provided a public service to the Mexican American population in that geographical area. A second geographical area, Midland, Texas, was selected for testing the paper and pencil materials in a classroom setting.

Test Instruments and Independent Variables

The field testing instrument used in the two previous video field testing plans was revised and expanded for utilization with thirty video-programs. This test instrument consists of six parts, with particular reference to three attitudinal factors and three linguistic variables. The instrument is bilingual in nature, incorporating Spanish in the instructions given to the interviewee and Spanish and English in the content. The three attitudinals variables are (1) attitudes toward English usage, (2) attitudes toward program characters and situations, and (3) attitudes toward cultural, acting, musical, dancing and repetitive voice features in the video programs. And the three linguistic variables are English comprehension, English usage, and English vocabulary.

The video field testing instrument was designed to be administered orally. There are three categories in the scoring. The attitudinal components are rated according to the categories favorable, indifferent, or unfavorable, with 2 representing the first, 1 the second, and 0 the third category respectively. The linguistic components are rated according to the categories correct, partially correct, and incorrect, with 2 representing the first, 1 he second, and 0 the third category respectively. Checkmarks are used to indicate the interviewee's responses observed by the interviewer. Spaces are provided at the end of each test component to insert subscores and total scores.

The video field testing instrument was reviewed by at least three bilingual Laboratory staff members with representatives from the Bureau of Communications, University of Arizona. Additionally, it was pilot tested among a small sample of non-English speaking Mexican American adults in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Based on these observations, a few items were added, deleted,

or revised to produce a complete and reliable measuring instrument, reflecting the content components and objectives of the Empleen Ingles video program series.

The paper and pencil instrument was designed to ascertain the English language oral proficiency of Spanish-speaking Americans. The content is based on English as a second language (ESL) lessons designed by the West Texas Education Agency in Midland, Texas, with reference to the thirty Empleen Ingles video programs. The linguistic variables included in the paper and pencil instrument are English comprehension, English usage, and English vocabulary. The instrument can be used as a pre- and post-test instrument relative to thirty paper and pencil lessons. It also can be used with the video field testing instrument relative to content in the Empleen Ingles video programs.

The test items in the paper and pencil test instrument must be presented orally and individually. Interview responses are then recorded on a rating scale, ranging from 0 to 2 points. In this respect, "2" is a perfect or almost perfect answer, where both the language content and pronunciation leave little to be desired; "1" relates to a response which has either the pronunciation or the language content partially correct; and "0" represents a response where the pronunciation and/or language content is totally absent or incomprehensible.

A bilingual laboratory staff member reviewed the content of the instrument with representatives from the West Texas Educational Agency. Additionally, the instrument was pilot tested with a small sample of Mexican American adults in Albuquerque to ascertain the relevancy of the test items, the administration time, and the scoring criteria.

Field Testing Team Selection and Training

A field testing area coordinator was selected from Fresno, California to provide assistance in coordinating the field testing in that geographical area. Six other persons were selected by the area coordinator to administer the tests among the treatment groups in Fresno and outlying rural communities. A one-day training institute was conducted by two SWCEL field testing staff members to familiarize the Fresno field testing team with the research design test and field testing procedures. A similar institute was conducted by one of the SWCEL field testing staff members to familiarize the Midland, Texas field testing team with the research design, paper and pencil instrument, and field testing procedures.

Field Testing Design

A pre-test and two post-tests were used to ascertain oral English achievement gain and attitudinal changes among three experimental groups exposed to video and paper and pencil programs in Fresno. The inclusion of a second post-test, approximately twenty days subsequent to the program exposures and the first post-test, served to indicate the degree of learning retention in oral English among the experimental groups. In Midland, Texas where only the paper and pencil program was used, the time factor prevented the application of a second post-test. The recruitment of participants for a classroom setting in Midland consumed a longer period of time than the recruitment of participants for the home setting in Fresno. Consequently, it was not possible to allow a twenty day lapse between the first and second post tests within the overall field testing schedule. Thus, the retention effect has been analyzed only in reference to the field testing conditions in Fresno.

Statistical Analyses Design

Three types of analyses were used to ascertain gain in oral English development, attitudinal changes relative to three attitudinal variables, and comparative differences between experimental conditions. Analyses of variance were used to determine significant differences between pre-test and post-test 1 means, as well as between the first and second post-test 2 means. The same type of analyses were performed to ascertain significant differences between post-test 1 means and post-test 2 means, with particular reference to retention effects on English language comprehension and usage. Analyses of covariance were used to determine the significant difference on oral English achievement and attitudinal changes between the experimental groups. A simple analysis also was applied to provide data on oral English achievement, based on percentage gain. Specifically, the statistical analyses plan was designed to focus on the following:

1. To determine the significant gain in oral English comprehension and usage for each of the treatment conditions.

2. To ascertain the significant differences in oral English development and attitudinal changes between the given treatment conditions.

3. To determine the significant changes in attitudes (positively or negatively) toward English usage and video program characters and situations among the treatment groups.

4. To calculate the retention of oral English achievement within and between the different treatment conditions, with particular reference to twenty or thirty days following program exposure.

III. STATISTICAL ANALYSES AND FINDINGS

Experimental Group Achievement in Oral English Based on Analysis of Variance and Percentage Gain or Loss, Using the Paper and Pencil Test Instrument.

Table I shows the statistical findings in oral English achievement for two experimental conditions in the study, based on the paper and pencil test instrument. One population group, urban in nature, was provided with paper and pencil materials in Midland, Texas. Two types of population groups, urban and rural, were provided with paper and pencil materials (plus a tutor from the same home setting) and the video programs in Fresno, California. The findings reveal dramatic achievement in each of the language variables (comprehension, usage, and vocabulary) in all of the treatment conditions. It also is noted that the greatest gains appear among the groups provided with paper/pencil and video programs. While all of the mean gains are noted at or beyond the .01 level of confidence, the percentage gains also appear consistently beyond 100 percent.

The total possible scores for the three language variables are as follows: 32 in comprehension, 38 in usage, and 112 in vocabulary. In this respect, all of the post test means are beyond 50 percent relative to the total possible scores, and in the majority of instances the mean gains are beyond 75 percent.

The test data from Group 2 video program and paper/pencil treatment group (excluding a tutor) are not observed in the analysis due to discrepancies in the testing and data collecting processes by two of the field testors. However, the data collected from Groups 3 and 4 described in the first paragraph of this section provide sufficient evidence on the paper and pencil program effects. These data also provide an indication on the

degree of achievement gain on a pre-test versus post-test 2 basis. The statistical data in Table III show some slight changes in post-test 2 means; however, the achievement gains between the pre- and post-test scores remain highly significant among all the treatment groups except Treatment Group 2. As is evident in the previous comparisons (pre- versus post-test 1), the degree of gain in the majority of the conditions and variables is at or beyond the .01 level of confidence. And the percentage gain appears dramatically high (30 percent and above) in most of the statistical comparisons.

TABLE I

Experimental Group Achievement
in Oral English Based on Analysis of Variance,
Using Test 2--Paper/Pencil Instrument
(Pre-Test versus Post Test 1)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Pre-Test Post Test Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Change
Urban--Paper/Pencil Programs	Comprehension (Test 2)	18 18	6.50 18.00	4.72 7.39	16 31	0 2	29.27**	176.92
Urban--Paper/Pencil Programs	Usage (Test 2)	18 18	8.28 22.22	7.21 7.66	28 35	0 0	29.88**	168.46
Urban--Paper/Pencil Programs	Vocabulary (Test 2)	18 18	22.83 66.78	13.59 21.21	55 96	0 11	51.70**	192.46
Rural--Video, Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Comprehension (Test 2)	22 22	5.27 26.73	2.07 3.56	10 32	1 4	570.46**	406.90
Rural--Video, Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Usage (Test 2)	22 22	2.86 28.91	1.91 3.45	6 37	0 21	915.29**	909.52
Rural--Video, Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Vocabulary (Test 2)	22 22	25.64 94.68	8.77 6.85	40 112	9 84	807.99**	269.33
Urban--Video, Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Comprehension (Test 2)	18 18	9.33 25.22	9.09 5.71	28 32	0 14	37.26**	170.24

* Denotes significant difference at the .05 level of confidence in all of the statistical tables.

**Denotes significant difference at the .01 level of confidence in all of the statistical tables.

TABLE I
(Continued)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Pre-Test Post Test Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Change
Urban--Video, Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Usage (Test 2)	18 18	13.94 30.83	7.42 5.43	27 38	0 23	57.36**	121.12
Urban--Video, Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Vocabulary (Test 2)	18 18	44.28 104.17	27.47 7.04	112 112	0 90	75.81**	135.26

TABLE II

Experimental Group Achievement
in Oral English Based on Analysis of Variance,
Using Test 1--Video Test Instrument
(Pre-Test versus Post Test 1)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Pre-Test Post Test Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Gain
Urban-- Video Program	Comprehension (Test 1)	24 24	58.88 85.83	16.00 13.37	81 99	4 42	38.47**	45.78
Urban-- Video Program	Usage (Test 1)	24 24	39.29 66.63	11.47 11.41	54 74	2 20	65.66**	69.57
Urban-- Video Program	Vocabulary (Test 1)	24 24	66.38 92.71	10.29 7.51	88 100	49 65	98.18**	39.67
Rural-- Video Program	Comprehension (Test 1)	17 17	22.88 82.65	13.33 9.54	69 100	7 65	212.69**	261.18
Rural-- Video Program	Usage (Test 1)	17 17	13.76 65.06	8.93 11.63	28 80	0 36	195.64**	372.65
Rural-- Video Program	Vocabulary (Test 1)	17 17	19.94 98.71	9.01 4.66	37 102	8 86	965.08**	394.99
Urban-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Comprehension (Test 1)	12 12	59.50 65.75	24.19 16.92	100 100	25 43	.49	10.50
Urban-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Usage (Test 1)	12 12	46.75 53.75	18.13 13.90	73 80	12 33	1.03	14.97
Urban-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Vocabulary (Test 1)	12 12	56.33 65.67	25.09 21.93	95 102	15 33	.86	16.57

TABLE II
(Continued)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Pre-Test Post Test Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Gain
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Comprehension (Test 1)	12 12	85.25 85.83	19.85 9.14	100 100	22 72	.00	.68
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Usage (Test 1)	12 12	57.42 57.17	20.11 19.72	78 78	0 0	.00	-.44
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Vocabulary (Test 1)	12 12	85.83 79.00	11.92 13.26	102 100	62 59	1.61	-7.96
Rural-- Video, Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Comprehension (Test 1)	22 22	47.00 78.00	34.19 11.24	94 97	0 57	15.80**	66.44
Rural-- Video, Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Usage (Test 1)	22 22	43.59 62.68	32.91 9.45	78 78	0 43	6.52*	43.80
Rural-- Video, Paper/P Program With Tutor	Vocabulary (Test 1)	22 22	85.82 88.73	13.45 10.58	100 102	45 67	.60	3.39
Urban-- Video, Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Comprehension (Test 1)	18 18	28.83 82.28	25.46 17.42	91 100	0 53	51.02**	185.36
Urban-- Video, Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Usage (Test 1)	18 18	26.00 67.50	16.02 16.15	75 80	5 29	56.55**	159.62

TABLE II
(Continued)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Pre-Test Post Test Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Gain
Urban--Video, Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Vocabulary (Test 1)	18 18	36.33 86.94	21.82 23.09	99 102	0 25	43.14**	139.30

TABLE III

Experimental Group Achievement
in Oral English Based on Analysis of Variance
and Percentage Gain/Loss,
Using Test 1--Video Test Instrument
(Pre-Test versus Post Test 2)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Pre-Test Post Test Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Gain
Urban--Video Program	Comprehension (Test 1)	24 24	58.88 82.58	15.99 12.03	81 99	4 40	32.27**	40.27
Urban--Video Program	Usage (Test 1)	24 24	39.29 66.96	11.47 7.08	54 80	2 45	96.91**	70.41
Urban--Video Program	Vocabulary (Test 1)	24 24	66.38 89.75	10.29 8.35	88 102	49 58	71.50**	35.22
Rural--Video Program	Comprehension (Test 1)	17 17	22.88 56.35	13.33 7.93	69 77	7 42	74.54**	146.27
Rural--Video Program	Usage (Test 1)	17 17	13.76 33.24	8.93 8.34	28 52	0 18	40.59**	141.45
Rural--Video Program	Vocabulary (Test 1)	17 17	19.94 73.47	9.01 12.21	37 97	8 57	199.06**	268.44
Urban--Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Comprehension (Test 1)	12 12	59.50 56.25	24.19 11.73	100 74	25 40	.16	-5.46
Urban--Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Usage (Test 1)	12 12	46.75 47.42	18.13 10.54	73 64	12 35	.01	1.43
Urban--Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Vocabulary (Test 1)	12 12	56.33 53.83	25.09 11.81	95 73	15 39	.08	-4.44

TABLE III
(Continued)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Pre-Test Post Test Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Gain
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Comprehension (Test 1)	12 12	85.25 66.17	19.85 13.13	100 94	22 50	7.07*	-22.39
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Usage (Test 1)	12 12	57.42 40.75	20.11 17.25	78 67	0 0	4.35*	-29.03
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Vocabulary (Test 1)	12 12	85.83 56.92	11.92 17.21	102 86	62 27	20.98*	-33.69
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs With Tutor	Comprehension (Test 1)	22 22	47.00 61.91	39.19 16.08	94 88	0 38	3.26*	31.72
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs With Tutor	Usage (Test 1)	22 22	43.59 50.86	32.91 13.40	78 69	0 25	.87	16.68
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs With Tutor	Vocabulary (Test 1)	22 22	85.82 76.45	13.45 12.72	100 94	45 42	5.37*	-10.91
Urban-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs With Tutor	Comprehension (Test 1)	18 18	28.83 65.83	25.46 22.48	91 100	0 30	20.17**	128.32
Urban-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs With Tutor	Usage (Test 1)	18 18	26.00 52.33	16.02 16.10	75 80	5 17	22.84**	101.28

TABLE III
(Continued)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Pre-Test Post Test Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Gain
Urban--Video and Paper/Pencil Programs With Tutor	Vocabulary (Test 1)	18	36.33	21.82	9	0	38.93**	129.51
		18	83.39	22.15	102	26		

Experimental Group Learning Retention in Oral English Based on Analysis of Variance and Percentage Gain or Loss

Analysis of variance was used to ascertain the degree of learning retention or loss in Oral English, with particular reference to 20 days subsequent to program exposure. A drop in English proficiency is noted (Table IV) among all of the treatment groups in the study. It is noteworthy that the significant drops occurred, most consistently, among the rural populations. Since the rural participants in the study are not generally exposed to the English-speaking media of the urban area, it is not surprising to find this effect. Yet, it is significant to note that in the previous comparison the degree of English proficiency among the participants, 20 days after program exposure, remained significantly higher as compared to their pre-test scores. Specifically, this means that while some loss in English proficiency occurs over a period of time following program exposure, the degree of ability to communicate in English remains relatively and significantly higher as compared to the pre-test findings.

A similar effect is noted in English comprehension, English usage, and English vocabulary based on the paper and pencil test instrument. The statistical data given in Table V show mean achievement drops among all the treatment groups relative to these three language variables, with the greater drops occurring among the rural population groups. However, as is indicated in the previous section, the final English proficiency level among the treatment groups remain relatively and significantly higher as compared to the pre-test results.

TABLE IV

Experimental Group Learning Retention
in Oral English Based on Analysis of Variance
and Percentage Gain/Loss,
Using Test 1--Video Test Instrument
(Post Test 1 versus Post Test 2)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Post Test 1 Post Test 2 Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Change
Urban--Video Program	Comprehension (Test 1)	24 24	85.83 82.58	13.37 12.03	99 99	42 40	.75	-3.79
Urban--Video Program	Usage (Test 1)	24 24	66.63 66.96	11.41 7.08	74 80	20 45	.01	.50
Urban--Video Program	Vocabulary (Test 1)	24 24	92.71 89.75	7.51 8.35	100 102	65 58	1.59	-3.19
Rural--Video Program	Comprehension (Test 1)	17 17	82.65 56.35	9.54 7.93	100 77	65 42	71.89**	-31.81
Rural--Video Program	Usage (Test 1)	17 17	65.06 33.24	11.63 8.34	80 52	36 18	79.06**	-48.92
Rural--Video Program	Vocabulary (Test 1)	17 17	98.71 73.47	4.66 12.21	102 97	86 57	59.61**	-25.57
Urban--Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Comprehension (Test 1)	12 12	65.75 56.25	16.92 11.73	100 74	43 40	2.34	-14.45
Urban--Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Usage (Test 1)	12 12	53.75 47.42	13.90 10.54	80 64	33 35	1.45	-11.78
Urban--Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Vocabulary (Test 1)	12 12	65.67 53.83	21.93 11.81	102 73	33 39	2.48	-18.02

TABLE IV
(Continued)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Post Test 1 Post Test 2 Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Change
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Comprehension (Test 1)	12 12	85.83 66.17	9.14 13.13	100 94	72 50	16.63**	-22.91
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Usage (Test 1)	12 12	57.17 40.75	19.72 17.25	78 67	0 0	4.31*	-28.72
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Vocabulary (Test 1)	12 12	79.00 56.92	13.26 17.21	100 86	59 27	11.36**	-27.95
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Comprehension (Test 1)	22 22	78.23 61.91	11.24 16.08	97 88	57 38	14.52**	-20.86
Rural-- Video and Paper.Pencil Program With Tutor	Usage (Test 1)	22 22	62.68 50.86	9.45 13.40	78 69	43 25	10.91**	-18.85
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Vocabulary (Test 1)	22 22	88.73 76.45	10.58 12.72	102 94	67 42	11.55**	-13.83
Urban-- Video and Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Comprehension (Test 1)	18 18	82.28 65.83	17.42 22.48	100 100	53 30	5.68*	-19.99
Urban-- Video and Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Usage (Test 1)	18 18	67.50 52.33	16.15 16.10	80 80	29 17	7.51**	-22.47

TABLE IV
(Continued)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Post Test 1 Post Test 2 Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Change
Urban-- Video and Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Vocabulary (Test 1)	18	86.94	23.09	102	25	.20	-4.09
		18	83.39	22.15	102	26		

TABLE V

Experimental Group Achievement in Oral English Based on Analysis of Variance and Percentage Gain/Loss Using Test 2, Paper/Pencil Instrument

Post Test 1 Versus Post Test 2

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Post Test 1 / Post Test 2 Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Change
Urban-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Comprehension	12	20.50	4.56	32	12	.12	3.66
	(Test 2)	12	21.25	5.39	32	14		
Urban-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Usage	12	24.92	5.36	38	14	.80	-7.69
	(Test 2)	12	23.00	4.64	30	15		
Urban-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Vocabulary	12	73.42	17.11	112	46	1.66	-12.94
	(Test 2)	12	63.92	17.45	102	40		
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Comprehension	12	23.92	5.50	32	14	8.08*	-28.92
	(Test 2)	12	17.00	5.90	28	8		
	Usage	12	26.75	4.66	32	17	22.18**	-37.69
	(Test 2)	12	16.67	5.36	28	9		
	Vocabulary	12	69.50	16.13	94	42	12.24**	-35.73
	(Test 2)	12	44.67	17.14	74	18		
Rural-- Video and	Comprehension	22	26.73	3.56	32	14	51.41**	-31.12
	(Test 2)	22	18.41	3.95	30	10		
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Usage	22	28.91	3.45	37	21	60.15**	-31.29
	(Test 2)	22	19.86	4.08	29	11		

TABLE V (Cont'd)

Experimental Group Achievement in Oral English Based on Analysis of Variance and Percentage Gain/Loss Using Test 2, Paper/Pencil Instrument Post Test 1 Versus Post Test 2

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Post Test 1 / Post Test 2 Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Change
Rural-- Video and Paper/Pencil Program with Tutor	Vocabulary	22 22	94.68 84.91	6.85 18.10	112 112	84 58	5.35*	-10.32
Urban-- Video and Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Comprehension (Test 2)	18 18	25.22 21.06	5.71 9.02	32 32	14 2	2.58	-16.52
Urban-- Video and Paper/Pencil With Tutor	Usage (Test 2)	18 18	30.83 22.67	5.43 11.81	38 38	23 3	6.70*	-26.49
Urban-- Video and Paper/Pencil With Tutor	Vocabulary (Test 2)	18 18	104.17 74.89	7.04 34.59	112 112	90 8	11.69**	-28.11

Attitudinal Change Relative to Oral English Usage Based on Analysis of Variance and Percentage Gain or Loss.

Tables VI, VII, and VIII show statistical data on treatment group attitudes toward oral English usage. Table VI provides data on a pre-test versus post-test 1 comparative analysis, Table VII shows findings on a pre-test versus post-test 2 comparison, and Table VIII reveals results on a post-test 1 versus post-test 2 comparison. Except in reference to one of the conditions (rural--video and paper/pencil programs with tutor), all of the comparative differences are relatively similar or insignificantly different. Yet, the mean scores (pre-and post) among all of the treatment groups are consistently in the favorable category. With 16 possible points, all of the group mean scores appear beyond a score of 11. While the first post-test means appear slightly higher than the pre-test means, the second post-test means remain relatively similar to those found in the first post-test. In essence, the data show population attitudinal scores relatively high with little or no change between the pre-test and post-tests.

Attitudinal Factor Relative to Video Program Characters and Situations Based on Analysis of Variance, Using the Video Test Instrument.

Since video program exposure is required prior to the presentation of this attitudinal test component to the program participants, a pre-test versus post-test analysis is not included in the statistical tables. Table IX shows the post-test 1 means relative to this attitudinal variable. A total score of 20 is possible on this test variable. In this respect, it is noted that the lowest of the experimental groups means is 12. Moreover, it is found that the combined treatment group scores average approximately 17 points. This clearly reveals a favorable attitude among the participants toward the

video program characters and situations. Additionally, the post-test 1 and post-test 2 comparative analysis (Table X) shows no significant difference among five out of the six treatment conditions between the two test results. This means that the participant attitudes remained relatively similar in the post-test 1 and post-test 2 findings.

Attitudinal Factor Relative to Cultural, Acting, Musical, Dancing, and Repetitive Voice Features, Using the Video Test Instrument.

A total of 10 points are possible on this attitudinal variable. Table XI reveals highly favorable responses among the treatment groups on this variable. The mean scores on this attitudinal component range between 6.25 and 9.67, with the combined group scores averaging 7.99. And in comparing the two post-test scores (post-test 1 and post-test 2) in terms of analysis of variance, a very close similarity is indicated. Thus, the statistical findings consistently reveal favorable attitudes by the program participants on the three attitudinal variables given in the video test instrument, with little or no change in attitudes noted between the two post-test measures.

TABLE VI

Attitudinal Change Relative to Oral English Usage
Based on Analysis of Variance and Percentage Gain/Loss
Using Test 1--Video Instrument
(Pre Test Versus Post Test 1)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Post Test 1 Post Test 2 Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Change
Urban--Video Program	Attitudinal (1)	24 24	11.83 13.08	4.57 8.20	16 16	5 5	.40	10.56
Rural--Video Program	Attitudinal (1)	17 17	13.59 14.65	3.09 2.06	16 16	6 8	1.30	7.79
Urban--Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Attitudinal (1)	12 12	12.92 12.33	4.21 4.07	16 16	3 5	.10	-4.52
Rural--Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Attitudinal (1)	12 12	13.50 14.17	1.98 1.82	16 16	10 10	.67	4.94
Rural--Video and Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Attitudinal (1)	22 22	12.27 16.00	1.71 .00	14 16	9 16	99.71**	30.37
Urban--Video and Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Attitudinal (1)	18 18	12.17 11.11	4.80 3.20	16 16	1 5	.56	-8.68

TABLE VII

Attitudinal Change Relative to Oral English Usage Based on Analysis of Variance and Percentage Gain/Loss, Using Test 1--Video Instrument (Pre Test Versus Post Test 2)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Post Test 1 Post Test 2 Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Change
Urban--Video Program	Attitudinal (1)	24 24	11.83 11.96	4.57 4.35	16 16	5 5	.00	1.06
Rural--Video	Attitudinal (1)	17 17	13.59 14.53	3.09 8.71	16 46	6 5	.16	6.93
Urban--Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Attitudinal (1)	12 12	12.92 13.42	4.21 3.35	16 16	3 6	.09	3.87
Rural--Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Attitudinal (1)	12 12	13.50 14.17	1.98 1.82	16 16	10 10	.67	4.94
Rural--Video and Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Attitudinal (1)	22 22	12.27 15.50	1.71 .94	14 16	9 13	57.37**	26.30
Urban Video and Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Attitudinal (1)	18 18	12.17 12.72	4.80 3.78	16 16	1 5	.14	4.57

TABLE VIII

Attitudinal Change Relative to Oral English Usage Based on Analysis of Variance and Percentage Gain/Loss Using Test 1--Video Instrument (Post Test 1 Versus Post Test 2)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Post Test 1 Post Test 2 Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Change
Urban Video	Attitudinal (1)	24 24	13.08 11.96	8.20 4.35	46 16	5 5	.33	-8.60
Rural Video Program	Attitudinal (1)	17 17	14.65 14.53	2.06 8.71	16 46	8 5	.00	-.80
Urban Video and Paper/Pencil Programs	Attitudinal (1)	12 12	12.33 13.42	4.07 3.25	16 16	5 6	.47	8.78
Rural Video and Paper/Pencil Program	Attitudinal (1)	12 12	14.17 14.17	1.82 1.82	16 16	10 10	.00	.00
Rural Video and Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Attitudinal (1)	22 22	16.00 15.50	.00 .94	16 16	16 13	5.92*	-3.13
Urban Video and Paper/Pencil Program With Tutor	Attitudinal (1)	18 18	11.11 12.73	3.20 3.78	16 16	5 5	1.79	14.4

TABLE IX

Attitudinal Factor Relative to Video Program Characters and Situations Using Test 1--Video Instrument (Post Test 1 Mean Scores)

Setting and Condition	Variable	Post Test 1 n	Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score
Urban Video Program	Attitudinal (2)	24	17.67	3.37	20	10
Rural Video Program	Attitudinal (2)	17	18.47	1.50	20	19
Urban Video and	Attitudinal (2)	12 12	14.08	4.48	20	5.0
Rural Video and Paper/Pencil Progs.	Attitudinal (2)	12	19.33	1.80	20	15
Rural Video and Paper/Pencil Progs. With Tutor	Attitudinal (2)	22	18.82	2.37	20	12
Urban Video and Paper/Pencil Progs. With Tutor	Attitudinal (2)	18	12.39	4.93	20	5

TABLE X

Attitudinal Change Relative to Video Program Characters and Situations Based on Analysis of Variance and Percentage Gain/Loss Using Test 1--Video Instrument (Post Test 1 versus Post Test 2 Scores)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Post Test 1 Post Test 2 Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Change
Urban Video	Attitudinal (2)	24 24	17.67 17.17	3.37 3.86	20 20	10 9	.21	-2.83
Rural Video Program	Attitudinal (2)	17 17	18.47 15.88	1.50 4.81	20 20	15 6	4.21*	-14.01
Urban Video and Paper/Pencil Progs.	Attitudinal (2)	12 12	14.08 14.75	4.48 3.65.	20 20	5 7	.14	4.73
Rural Video and Programs	Attitudinal (2)	12 12	18.33 18.33	1.80 1.80	20 20	15 15	.00	.00
Rural Video and Paper/Pencil Progs. With Tutor	Attitudinal (2)	22 22	18.82 18.68	2.37 2.34	20 20	12 12	.03	-.72
Urban Video and Paper/Pencil Progs. With Tutor	Attitudinal (2)	18 18	12.39 11.72	4.93 4.99	20 20	5 5	.15	-9.99

TABLE XI

Attitudinal Factor Relative to Cultural, Acting, Musical, Dancing, and Repetitive Voice Features, Using Test 1--Video Instrument (Post Test 1 Mean Scores)

Setting and Condition	Variable	Post Test 1 n	Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score
Urban Video Program	Attitudinal (3)	24	8.33	2.21	10.	3.
Rural Video Programs	Attitudinal (3)	17	7.24	1.66	10.	5.
Urban Video and Paper/Pencil Progs.	Attitudinal (3)	12	6.25	2.52	10	2
Rural Video and Paper/Pencil Progs.	Attitudinal (3)	12	9.67	.75	10	8
Rural Video and Paper/Pencil Progs. With Tutor	Attitudinal (3)	22	9.27	1.63	10	5
Urban Video and Paper/Pencil Progs. With Tutor	itudinal (3)	18	7.17	3.08	10	0

TABLE XII

Attitudinal Change Relative to Cultural, Acting, Dancing and Repetitive Voice Features, Based on Analysis of Variance and Percentage Gain/Loss Using Test 1--Video Instrument (Post Test 1 Versus Post Test 2)

Setting and Condition	Variable	n	Post Test 1 Post Test 2 Means	St'd Dev.	High Score	Low Score	F Ratio	% Change
Urban Video	Attitudinal (3)	24 24	8.33 8.08	2.21 2.34	10 10	3 3	.13	-3.0
Rural Video Program	Attitudinal (3)	17 17	7.24 6.82	1.66 3.28	10 10	5 0	.20	-5.69
Urban Video	Attitudinal (3)	12 12	6.25 6.25	2.52 2.59	10 10	2 2	.00	.00
Rural Video and	Attitudinal (3)	12 12	9.67 9.67	.75 .75	10 10	8 8	.00	.00
Rural Video ,Paper/Pencil With Tutor	Attitudinal (3)	22 22	9.27 9.23	1.63 1.68	10 10	5 5	.00	-.49
Urban Video and Paper/ Pencil With Tutor	Attitudinal (3)	18 18	7.17 7.33	3.08 2.85	10 10	0 1	.02	2.3

Experimental Group Differences in Oral English Achievement Based on Analysis of Covariance, Using the Video Test Instrument.

Analyses of covariance were performed to determine the significant differences between the treatment groups on the three attitudinal factors and the three oral English variables. Specifically, the analyses were applied as follows:

Treatment Group 1 versus Treatment Group 2
Treatment Group 1 versus Treatment Group 3
Treatment Group 2 versus Treatment Group 3
Treatment Group 2 versus Treatment Group 4
Treatment Group 3 versus Treatment Group 4

The analyses were applied only on pre-test and post-test 1 data. Additionally, urban and rural treatment effects were compared on the same variables. The statistical findings relative to these comparisons are given in Table XIII. Again, it must be noted that the statistical findings relative to Treatment Condition 2 are not interpreted with complete validity due to discrepancies in the field testing and data collecting in this particular situation. However, the testing and data collecting in all of the other treatment groups (1, 3, and 4) were carried in accordance to the field testing plan; therefore, the findings relative to these conditions are considered significantly valid and highly noteworthy. Thus, the following inferences are drawn in terms of comparative differences between treatment conditions 1, 3, and 4.

Table XIII shows a close similarity between Treatment Condition 1 (video program) and Treatment Condition 3 (video program and paper/pencil materials with tutor) in five of the six variables. The only difference, at the .01 level of confidence, appears in favor of Treatment Condition 1 in attitudinal variable 2 (attitude toward program characters and situations).

Otherwise, a close relationship appears between the adjusted post-test means in all other attitudinal factors and language variables. This observation is equally apparent among both urban and rural populations in the Fresno area. Based on these statistical findings, it can be concluded that no significant differences appear between the treatment group post-test means in the majority of the test variables, and particularly in reference to oral English proficiency. However, this does not imply that similar achievement gains have been noted between the treatment groups. In the comparative analyses relative to achievement gains illustrated in Table I, it has been observed that greater achievement gains occurred when paper/pencil program materials were coupled with the video program series as compared to a single instructional program exposure (video or paper/pencil).

A comparative analysis was performed to determine the significant differences between urban and rural populations in each of the treatment conditions. The data in Table XIII again reveal a close relationship between treatment group means, urban versus rural, relative to all of the language variables. Only three significant differences were noted in reference to the attitudinal variables. This appeared in Treatment Condition 3 (video program and paper/pencil materials with tutor), with the higher means scored by the rural population in all three attitudinal variables. Nevertheless, the lower means for the urban population still fall between the indifferent and favorable categories in the test.

Experimental Group Differences in Oral English Achievement Based on Analysis of Covariance, Using the Paper and Pencil Test Instrument.

Analyses of covariance were applied to ascertain treatment group differences on English comprehension, English usage, and English vocabulary in terms of the paper and pencil instrument. In reference to Table XIV

which shows the comparative analyses between Treatment Group 3 (video program and paper/pencil materials with tutor) and Treatment Group 2 (paper and pencil program), significant mean differences are noted in favor of Treatment Group 3. This finding is consistent with the results given in Table 1, where greater oral English achievement is noted in favor of the combined programs (video and paper/pencil) as compared to a single medium.

A second analysis was performed to determine the significant difference between the urban and rural populations, using the paper/pencil test and the same variables. The results of this analysis, with particular reference to Treatment Group 3, show a close relationship between the means in two of the variables (comprehension and usage). A significant difference in favor of the urban population is noted in vocabulary; however, the actual mean difference is only 9 points between the two groups. It also is observed that the rural population had a lower pre-test score as compared to the urban population; thus, the percentage gain is really in favor of the former group on this particular variable.

In conclusion, the most important finding relative to the foregoing analyses is the difference between the combined program as compared to the single program effects. This finding clearly reveals a significant difference in favor of the dual-program series--video program combined with paper/pencil lessons.

TABLE XIII

Experimental Group Differences in Oral English Achievement Based on Analysis of Covariance, Using Test 1, Video Test Measurement.

Variable	Setting and Condition	N	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Adjusted Post Test Mean	St'd. Dev.	F Ratio
Attitudinal Variable 1	Urban-Cond. 1	24	11.83	13.08	13.41	8.20	.63
	Urban-Cond. 2	12	12.92	12.33	11.68	4.07	
Attitudinal Variable 2	Urban-Cond. 1	24	.00	17.67	18.62	3.37	4.65*
	Urban-Cond. 2	12	12.67	14.08	12.18	4.48	
Attitudinal Variable 3	Urban-Cond. 1	24	.00	8.33	8.62	2.21	2.50
	Urban-Cond. 2	12	6.83	6.25	5.68	2.52	
Comprehension	Urban-Cond. 1	24	58.88	85.83	85.87	13.37	14.75**
	Urban-Cond. 2	12	59.50	65.75	65.68	16.92	
Usage	Urban-Cond. 1	24	39.29	66.63	67.11	11.41	9.84**
	Urban-Cond. 2	12	46.75	53.75	52.79	13.90	
Vocabulary	Urban-Cond. 1	24	66.38	92.71	92.66	7.51	24.80**
	Urban-Cond. 2	12	56.33	65.67	65.77	21.93	
Attitudinal Variable 1	Urban-Cond. 2	12	12.92	12.33	12.33	4.07	.74
	Urban-Cond. 3	18	12.17	11.11	11.12	3.20	
Attitudinal Variable 2	Urban-Cond. 2	12	12.67	14.08	13.58	4.48	.08
	Urban-Cond. 3	18	1.50	12.39	12.73	4.93	
Attitudinal Variable 3	Urban-Cond. 2	12	6.83	6.25	5.95	2.52	1.20
	Urban-Cond. 3	18	3.11	7.17	7.37	3.08	
Comprehension	Urban-Cond. 2	12	59.50	65.75	62.75	16.92	7.87**
	Urban-Cond. 3	18	28.83	82.28	84.28	17.42	
Usage	Urban-Cond. 2	12	46.75	53.75	51.40	13.90	6.64*
	Urban-Cond. 3	18	26.00	67.50	69.07	16.15	
Vocabulary	Urban-Cond. 2	12	56.33	65.67	66.18	21.93	4.48*
	Urban-Cond. 3	18	36.33	86.94	86.60	23.09	
Attitudinal Variable 1	Urban-Cond. 1	24	11.83	13.08	13.18	8.20	1.41
	Urban-Cond. 3	18	12.17	11.11	10.98	3.20	
Attitudinal Variable 2	Urban-Cond. 1	24	.00	17.67	17.56	3.37	12.96**
	Urban-Cond. 3	18	1.50	12.39	12.53	4.93	
Attitudinal Variable 3	Urban-Cond. 1	24	.00	8.33	8.52	2.21	2.37
	Urban-Cond. 3	18	3.11	7.17	6.92	3.08	

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Variable	Setting and Condition	N	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Adjusted Post Test Mean	Std. Dev.	F Ratio
Comprehension	Urban-Cond. 1 Urban-Cond. 3	24 18	58.88 28.83	85.83 82.28	81.74 87.74	13.37 17.42	1.19
Usage	Urban-Cond. 1 Urban-Cond. 3	24 18	39.29 26.00	66.63 67.50	64.96 69.71	11.41 16.15	1.02
Vocabulary	Urban-Cond. 1 Urban-Cond. 3	24 18	66.38 36.33	92.71 86.94	92.48 87.25	7.51 23.09	.54
Attitudinal Variable 1	Rural-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 2	17 12	13.59 13.50	14.65 14.17	14.65 14.17	2.06 1.82	.04
Attitudinal Variable 2	Rural-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 2	17 12	3.29 19.25	18.47 18.33	18.81 17.85	1.50 1.80	.63
Attitudinal Variable 3	Rural-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 2	17 12	1.53 9.92	9.24 9.67	9.31 9.27	1.44 .75	0.50
Comprehension	Rural-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 2	17 12	22.88 85.25	82.65 85.83	83.01 85.32	9.54 9.14	.09
Usage	Rural-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 2	17 12	13.76 57.42	65.06 57.17	74.30 44.07	11.63 19.72	9.91**
Vocabulary	Rural-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 2	17 12	19.94 85.83	98.71 79.00	102.65 73.42	4.66 13.26	5.93*
Attitudinal Variable 1	Rural-Cond. 2 Rural-Cond. 3	12 22	13.50 12.27	14.17 16.00	14.15 16.01	1.82 .00	19.17**
Attitudinal Variable 2	Rural-Cond. 2 Rural-Cond. 3	12 22	19.25 .00	18.33 18.81	23.55 15.97	1.80 2.37	.79
Attitudinal Variable 3	Rural-Cond. 2 Rural-Cond. 3	12 22	9.92 .00	9.67 9.27	-2.00 15.64	.745 1.63	1.45
Comprehension	Rural-Cond. 2 Rural-Cond. 3	12 22	85.25 47.00	85.83 78.23	86.65 77.78	9.14 11.24	3.67
Usage	Rural-Cond. 2 Rural-Cond. 3	12 22	57.42 43.59	57.17 62.68	56.87 62.84	19.72 9.45	1.24
Vocabulary	Rural-Cond. 2 Rural-Cond. 3	12 22	85.83 85.82	79.00 88.73	79.00 88.73	13.26 10.58	5.07*
Attitudinal Variable 1	Rural-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 3	17 22	13.59 12.27	14.65 16.00	14.62 16.02	2.06 .00	8.84**

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Variable	Setting and Condition	N	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Adjusted Post Test Mean	St'd. Dev.	F Ratio
Attitudinal Variable 2	Rural-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 3	17 22	3.29 .00	18.47 18.82	18.34 18.92	1.50 2.37	.63
Attitudinal Variable 3	Rural-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 3	17 22	1.53 .00	7.24 9.28	7.18 9.32	1.66 1.63	13.26**
Comprehension	Rural-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 3	17 22	22.88 47.00	82.65 78.23	82.22 78.56	9.54 11.24	.90
Usage	Rural-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 3	17 22	13.76 43.59	65.06 62.68	63.30 64.04	11.63 9.45	.04
Vocabulary	Rural-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 3	17 22	19.94 85.82	98.71 88.73	97.33 89.79	4.66 10.58	.79
Attitudinal Variable 1	Urban-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 1	24 17	11.83 13.59	13.08 14.65	13.78 13.66	0.20 2.06	.00
Attitudinal Variable 2	Urban-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 1	24 17	.00 3.29	17.67 18.47	17.76 18.33	3.37 1.50	.34
Attitudinal Variable 3	Urban-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 1	24 17	.00 1.53	8.33 7.24	8.38 7.17	2.21 1.66	2.
Comprehension	Urban-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 1	24 17	58.88 22.88	85.83 82.65	81.61 88.62	13.37 9.54	1.51
Usage	Urban-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 1	24 17	39.29 13.76	66.63 65.06	64.72 67.75	11.41 11.63	.27
Vocabulary	Urban-Cond. 1 Rural-Cond. 1	24 17	66.38 19.94	92.71 98.71	91.18 100.87	7.51 4.66	3.23
Attitudinal Variable 1	Urban-Cond. 2 Urban-Cond. 2	12 12	12.92 13.50	12.33 14.17	12.35 14.15	4.07 1.82	1.69
Attitudinal Variable 2	Urban-Cond. 2 Urban-Cond. 2	12 12	12.67 19.25	14.08 18.33	14.68 17.74	4.48 1.80	2.60
Attitudinal Variable 3	Urban-Cond. 2 Rural-Cond. 2	12 12	6.83 9.92	6.25 9.47	6.47 9.45	2.52 .74	8.84**
Comprehension	Urban-Cond. 2 Rural-Cond. 2	12 12	59.50 85.25	65.75 85.83	65.62 85.97	16.92 9.14	8.78**
Usage	Urban-Cond. 2 Rural-Cond. 2	12 12	46.75 57.42	53.75 57.17	56.02 54.90	13.90 19.72	.03

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Variable	Setting and Condition	N	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Adjusted Post Test Mean	St'd. Dev.	F Ratio
Vocabulary	Urban-Cond. 2 Rural-Cond. 2	12 12	56.33 85.83	65.67 79.00	66.13 78.54	21.93 13.26	1.58
Attitudinal Variable 1	Urban-Cond. 3 Rural-Cond. 3	18 22	12.17 12.27	11.11 16.00	11.11 16.00	3.20 .00	47.66**
Attitudinal Variable 2	Urban-Cond. 3 Rural-Cond. 3	18 22	1.50 .00	12.39 18.82	12.53 18.71	4.93 2.37	22.78**
Attitudinal Variable 3	Urban-Cond. 3 Rural-Cond. 3	18 22	3.11 .00	7.17 9.27	6.93 9.47	3.08 1.63	6.99**
Comprehension	Urban-Cond. 3 Rural-Cond. 2	18 22	28.83 47.00	82.28 78.23	82.86 77.75	17.42 11.24	1.08
Usage	Urban-Cond. 3 Rural-Cond. 3	18 22	26.00 43.59	67.50 62.68	67.10 63.01	16.15 9.45	.84
Vocabulary	Urban-Cond. 3 Rural-Cond. 3	18 22	36.33 85.82	86.94 88.73	86.27 89.28	23.09 10.58	.09

TABLE XIV

Experimental Group Differences in Oral English Achievement Based on Analysis of Covariance, Using Test 2, Paper and Pencil Test Instrument

Variable	Setting and Condition	N	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Adjusted Post Test Mean	St'd. Dev.	F Ratio
Comprehension	Urban-Cond. 2	12	21.92	20.50	20.09	4.56	3.93
	Urban-Cond. 3	18	9.33	25.50	25.50	5.71	
Usage	Urban-Cond. 2	12	27.83	24.92	24.86	5.36	3.62
	Urban-Cond. 3	18	13.94	30.83	30.87	5.43	
Vocabulary	Urban-Cond. 2	12	75.58	73.42	73.36	17.11	28.71**
	Urban-Cond. 3	18	44.28	104.17	104.21	7.04	
Comprehension	Rural-Cond. 2	12	29.25	23.92	23.97	5.50	.10
	Rural-Cond. 3	22	5.28	26.73	26.70	3.56	
Usage	Rural-Cond. 2	12	30.67	26.75	29.08	4.66	0.82
	Rural-Cond. 3	22	2.86	28.91	27.64	3.45	
Vocabulary	Rural-Cond. 2	12	85.58	69.50	74.77	16.13	3.15
	Rural-Cond. 3	22	25.64	94.68	91.81	6.85	
Comprehension	Urban-Cond. 2	12	21.92	20.50	14.56	4.55	2.12
	Urban-Cond. 4	18	6.50	18.00	21.96	7.39	
Usage	Urban-Cond. 2	12	27.83	24.92	24.06	5.36	.16
	Urban-Cond. 4	18	8.28	22.22	22.80	7.66	
Vocabulary	Urban-Cond. 2	12	75.58	73.42	69.67	17.11	.10
	Urban-Cond. 4	18	22.83	66.78	69.28	21.21	
Comprehension	Urban-Cond. 3	18	9.33	25.22	25.00	5.71	8.12**
	Urban-Cond. 4	18	6.50	18.00	18.22	7.39	
Usage	Urban-Cond. 3	18	13.94	30.83	30.74	5.43	11.16**
	Urban-Cond. 4	18	8.28	22.22	22.32	7.66	
Vocabulary	Urban-Cond. 3	18	44.28	104.17	104.44	7.04	38.4**
	Urban-Cond. 4	18	22.83	66.78	66.50	21.21	
Comprehension	Urban-Cond. 3	18	9.33	25.22	25.16	5.71	1.11
	Rural-Cond. 3	22	5.27	26.73	26.78	3.58	
Usage	Urban-Cond. 3	18	13.94	30.83	30.88	5.42	.17
	Rural-Cond. 3	22	2.86	28.91	28.87	3.45	
Vocabulary	Urban-Cond. 3	18	44.28	104.17	103.96	7.04	12.2**
	Rural-Cond. 3	22	25.64	94.68	94.85	6.85	

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In 1967, the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory conceptualized a program design for developing the English-speaking ability of non-English speaking, Spanish speaking Americans. This program is based on innovative instructional features such as rhythmic voice patterns, musical effects, choreography, cartoon effects, realistic characters, and animation. In a sense, the language media is bilingual, for the program utilizes Spanish to facilitate oral English development.

The medium of television was selected to reach the target population. This is based on the notion that many workers find it difficult or impossible to attend formal classes; thus, the video programs are designed to bring instruction to the participants' home.

The program components designed to facilitate the learning of English differ from the single-person medium, which is found in other television foreign language instructional programs. It was hypothesized that these innovative program components would serve as motivating, stimulating, and reinforcing factors in the learning process.

In the year 1968-69, the first five television programs were field tested. The results of this first study indicated significant and positive learning among the population groups in the plan. A second field testing was conducted in 1969-70 to ascertain the learning effects of fifteen video programs among three different Spanish-speaking ethnic groups; namely, Mexican Americans, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans. Again, the findings revealed positive learning effects among all of the groups in the study.

The video programs for oral English instruction were developed by the Television Communications Bureau at the University of Arizona, under subcontract with the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, and

became known as the Empleen Ingles Series. By the year 1970, this department of the University of Arizona had revised and completed a total of thirty video programs. At this point, development was discontinued and the Laboratory undertook a more comprehensive field testing of the thirty video programs.

Additionally, by 1970 the West Texas Educational agency in Midland, Texas had designed and developed thirty paper and pencil lessons related to the content in the video programs. This series had not been field tested, and the Laboratory undertook this task as part of the 1970-71 field testing plan for Adult Basic Education products.

Several major questions relative to the Empleen Ingles and paper and pencil lessons remained to be answered in the 1970-71 field testing plan. The first question was related to the instructional effectiveness of the thirty video programs and paper and pencil lessons. The second question was in reference to the two programs as single or dual instructional media. The third question was related to target population attitudes toward English usage and video program characters. And the fourth major question was given in terms of learning retention among program participants subsequent to a time period following the final program exposure.

The findings in this study substantiate the results of the previous field testing studies in terms of oral English development. Based on the paper and pencil test instrument and analysis of variance, the findings reveal dramatic achievement in English comprehension, English usage, and English vocabulary in treatment conditions 3_R and 4. All of the mean gains are noted at or beyond the .01 level of confidence, and the percentage gains appear consistently beyond 100 percent.

The test data from Treatment Group 2 were not observed in the analysis due to discrepancies in the testing and data collecting processes. However, the data collected from the other treatment conditions (3 and 4) are specifically in accordance with the field testing plan and are considered highly valid and significantly noteworthy.

Based on the video test instrument and analysis of variance, the findings again show dramatic achievement in English comprehension, English usage, and English vocabulary among the treatment groups. The majority of the gains are represented at or beyond the .01 level of confidence, and the percentage gain, in most of the cases, fall beyond 50 percent. In reference to the aforementioned analyses and test instruments, it can be concluded that the thirty video programs and paper and pencil materials produced dramatic and significant achievement gains in English comprehension, English usage, and English vocabulary.

Analyses of variance were used to ascertain the degree of learning retention or loss in oral English, with particular reference to twenty days subsequent to program exposure. A drop in English proficiency is noted among all of the treatment groups in the study. It is noteworthy that the significant drops occurred, most consistently, among the rural populations. Since the rural populations in the study are not generally exposed to the English-speaking media of the urban areas, it is not surprising to find this effect. Yet, it is significant to note that the degree of English proficiency, twenty days after program exposure, remained significantly higher as compared to the pre-test scores. Specifically, this means that while some loss in English proficiency occurs over a period of time following program exposure, the degree of ability to communicate in English remains relatively and significantly higher as compared to the pre-test findings. A similar effect

is noted in English comprehension, English usage, and English vocabulary based on the paper and pencil test instrument.

Three attitudinal variables were examined in this study. The first variable relates to attitudes toward program characters and situations; the second variable pertains to attitudes toward English usage; and the third factor specifically refers to attitudes toward cultural, acting, musical, dancing, and repetitive voice components in the program. The statistical findings consistently reveal favorable attitudes by the program participants on the three aforementioned attitudinal variables, with little or no change in attitudes noted between the two post-test measures. In essence, the test results indicate favorable perceptions or attitudes toward the given program components among the participants in this field study.

Analyses of covariance were performed to determine the significant difference between the treatment groups on the three attitudinal factors and the three oral English variables. The statistical findings show a close relationship between the adjusted post-test means on the majority of the attitudinal variables and all of the language variables. This is equally apparent among both urban and rural populations in the Fresno area. Based on the statistical findings, it can be concluded that no significant differences appear between the treatment group post-test means in the majority of the test variables, and particularly in reference to oral English proficiency. However, this does not imply that similar achievement gains have been noted between the treatment groups. In the comparative analyses relative to achievement gain, it has been observed that greater achievement gains occurred when paper/pencil materials were coupled with the video program series as compared to a single medium exposure (video program or paper/pencil lessons).

A comparative analysis was performed to determine the significant differences between urban and rural populations in each of the experimental variables.

The statistical data show a close relationship between the treatment group means, urban versus rural, relative to all of the language variables. Only three significant differences were noted in reference to the attitudinal variables. This appeared in Treatment Condition 3 (video program and paper/pencil lessons with tutor), with the higher means scored by the rural population. Nevertheless, the lower means for the urban population still fall between the indifferent and favorable categories in the test.

Although it was not possible to compare the learning effects of Treatment Conditions 2 and 3, the data collected from three of the four conditions are sufficient to enable the evaluator to draw inferences and conclusions on the overall experimental effects. Treatment Condition 2 incorporated the video program and paper/pencil lessons without a tutor, while Treatment Condition 3 employed the video and paper/pencil lessons with a tutor. The tutor was not specifically assigned by the field tester. This person was to be available in the home setting; consequently, this variable was difficult to control. For example, the frequency of his participation in the tutoring process is an unknown factor. On the other hand, it also was not possible to control the exclusion of a tutor in Treatment Group 2. Thus, it is possible that Treatments 2 and 3 are quite similar in nature. It has been noted that Treatment Condition 2 was excluded from the interpretive data due to discrepancies by two testers in the testing processes. However, because of the similar nature of Treatment Conditions 2 and 3, in a realistic sense, it can be concluded that the existing results are relatively complete and significantly noteworthy.

In the final analysis, it has been unequivocably concluded that the Empleos Ingles Video Program and Paper/Pencil Lessons produce dramatic and significant gains in English comprehension, English usage, and English

vocabulary. It also has been concluded that a combination of the programs video and paper/pencil lessons, produce greater learning effects as compared to a single instructional medium (video or paper/pencil lessons). Based on the foregoing observations, it is highly suggested that the paper/pencil materials are more effective as a supplement to the Empleen Ingles video programs rather than as a separate instructional medium. The Empleen Ingles video series may be used as a separate instructional medium; however, greater gains can be achieved when the paper/pencil lessons are used as a supplementary and reinforcement medium.

The paper and pencil lessons can be used with or without a tutor. A tutor is not absolutely necessary for a literate person in Spanish, for the booklet instructions are provided in Spanish. However, the paper/pencil materials are irrelevant to the non-reader, non English speaker. The paper/pencil lessons proved effective with Treatment Group 4, where a teacher aide was provided in a classroom setting. Similar results were noted in Treatment Condition 3, where a tutor from the family setting was requested in the experimental plan. The degree of involvement of the tutor in the home setting is an unknown factor; however, it has been emphasized that the experimental findings indicate that the coupling of paper/pencil materials with video program instruction produces greater learning effects than a single instructional medium (video or paper/pencil materials).

The field testing results also reveal that the target populations in the study perceive the video program characters, situations, choreography and other entertainment features in a favorable light. While technical observers and educators may provide suggestions for further improvisation, negative attitudes toward the video programs appear relatively absent among the participants in the study.

The findings in this study do not imply that complete fluency in oral English communication has been achieved by the two instructional programs. It is inconceivable that thirty video programs and paper/pencil lessons can produce this ultimate effect. However, based on the language content provided in the programs and measured by specifically designed test instruments, it can be concluded that the thirty program exposures are dramatically effective in oral English development. And based on the foregoing field testing results, two recommendations are clearly apparent: One, it is recommended that a dissemination plan be conceptualized and implemented to provide the target population with these instructional programs; and two, it is highly recommended that consideration be extended to continue the development of the Empleen Ingles series until 100 or 150 video programs have been completed.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Treatment Groups Attrition Data

TREATMENT GROUP ATTRITION DATA

Treatment Group No.	Treatment Group Program Type	Pre-test Enrollment	Post-test	Percentage Drop
Treatment Group I (Urban)	Video Program (only)	24	24	0.
Treatment Group I (Rural)	Video Program (only)	24	17	29.
Treatment Group II (Urban)	Video Program and Paper/pencil Lessons	12	12	0.
Treatment Group II (Rural)	Video Program and Paper/pencil Lessons	12	12	0.
Treatment Group III (Urban)	Video Program and Paper/pencil Lessons with Tutor	24	18	25.
Treatment Group III (Rural)	Video Program and Paper/pencil Lessons with Tutor	24	22	10.
Treatment Group IV (Urban)	Paper/pencil Lessons (only)	24	18	25.
Treatment Group IV (Rural)	(A rural setting was not provided for this treatment condition)			
	Average percentage of Attrition (including all treatment groups)			14.8

The attrition percentage in this study ranged from 0 to 24% with the average dropout of participants (including all treatment groups) being 14.8%. Excellent participataion by program students was noted in this study.

APPENDIX B

Sample Pages from the Video Test Instrument

III. TEST QUESTIONS

A. Attitudes Toward English Usage (Pre-test and Post-test)

	2 Favorable	1 Indifferent	0 Unfavorable
1. ¿Cree Ud., que una persona en una situación como la suya pueda obtener empleo sin hablar nada de inglés?			
2. ¿Cree Ud., que una persona en una situación como la suya pueda aprender inglés a su edad?			
3. ¿Cree Ud. que el saber inglés le ayundaría a alcanzar un trabajo de supervisor?			
4. ¿Cree Ud. que el saber inglés le ayundaría tener mejor communicacion con sus niños?			
5. ¿Cree Ud. que el no saber inglés afecta mucho su vida?			
6. ¿Cree Ud. que el individuo que vive en los Estados Unidos tiene la obligacion de aprender a hablar el inglés?			
7. ¿Ha tenido ocasión en que Ud. no fue a algún lugar, o algun negocio por que no sabía hablar el inglés?			
8. ¿Recuerda Ud. alguna ocasión cuando Ud. o un conocido perdio dinero en algún negocio por no saber inglés?			
Column Totals:			

Total Score:

B. Attitudes Toward Program Characters and Situations
(Post-test only; do not pre-test)

	2 Favorable	1 Indifferent	0 Unfavorable
1. ¿Qué le pareció el sr. profesor?. .			
2. ¿Le gustó la manera en que el coronel da sus direcciones?			
3. ¿Cree Ud. que Bocatón sirve para ayudarle a Ud. a formar las palabras?			
4. ¿Le gusta la sra. Mora como profesora de inglés para adultos? .			
5. ¿Qué le pareció los televidentes o participantes en el programa? . .			
6. ¿Qué le pareció el sr. Avendaño?. .			
7. ¿Le parecieron niñerías algunas de las actividades que se usan para enseñar inglés en estas películas?			
8. ¿Cree Ud. que hubo demasiada repeticion en la enseñanza de algunas de las palabras u oraciones en inglés?			
9. ¿Le ofendio la mayoria de los televidentes?			
10. ¿Le ofendió la mayoría de las situationes donde se encuentra el mexicano en el programa? (cubanos, portorriqueños, etc.)			

Column Totals: ☐ ☐

Total Score: ☐

C. Attitudes Toward Cultural, Acting, Musical, Dancing, and Repetitive Voice Features

¿Qué pensó Ud. de las siguientes cosas que vio en la película?	2 Favorable	1 Indifferent	0 Unfavorable
1. Cantantes y bailes			
2. Fondo musical			
3. Actuación			
4. Referencia a la cultura Mexicana (cubano, portorriqueño, etc.)			
5. Ejercicios de repetición . . .			
Column Totals:			

Total Score:

D. English Comprehension

Directions: Part A

Ahora quiero que usted me conteste con una frase en ingles, o espanol para indicar que usted comprende lo que yo le digo.

Ejemplo: "Hello, how are you?" (Response: "Fine, thank you.")

	2 Correct	1 Partially Correct	0 Incorrect
1. What is your name: (Response: My name is _____.)			
2. Where do you live? (Response: I live in _____.) . . .			
3. How are you? (Response: I am fine, thank you. /or/ I am not feeling well.)			
4. What are you? (occupation) (Response: I am a _____.)			
5. What do you like to buy? (Response: I like to buy _____.) .			
6. What day is today? (Response: Today is _____.) . . .			
7. Do you work on Tuesday? (Response: Yes, I work on Tuesday.) .			
8. Do you like to get up early? (Response: Yes, I like to get up early. /or/ No, I do not like to get up early.)			
9. How old are you? (Response: I am _____ years old.) .			
10. Where do you work? (Response: I work at/in _____.) . .			
11. Do you have to go to the dentist? (Response: Yes/no, I have/do not have to go to the dentist.)			

E. English Usage

Yo le voy a decir una frase en español. Escuche bien la frase y dígame lo que significa en inglés.

Ejemplo: Qué quiere decir "Buenos días" en inglés?
(The response of the interviewee should be "Good Morning.")

	2	1	0
1. ¿Como se llama él? (Response: What is his name?) . .			
2. Siéntese, por favor. (Response: Please sit down.) . . .			
3. Es pan bueno. (Response: It's good bread.) . . .			
4. ¿Dónde vive? (Response: Where do you live?) . .			
5. Yo no tengo que ir al médico. (Response: I don't have to go to the doctor.)			
6. Hace frío. (Response: It's cold.)			
7. Él tiene hambre y quiere comer. (Response: He's hungry and wants to eat.)			
8. ¿Cómo se llama ella? (Response: What is her name?) . . .			
9. ¿Cómo está usted? (Response: How are you?)			
10. ¿Cómo se llama usted? (Response: What is your name?) . .			
11. A mi hijo le duelen los ojos. (Response; My son's eyes hurt.) . .			
12. ¿Qué necesita ella? (Response: What does she need?) . .			
13. Hace calorcito. (Response: It's warm.)			
14. Le duele la cabeza. (Response: His head hurts, or He has a headache.)			

F. English Vocabulary

Le voy a cedir una palabra en español. Escuche bien y dígame la palabra en inglés.

Ejemplo: Como se dice año en inglés?
(Response: Year.)

	2	1	0
1. Yo - I			
2. Él - He or him			
3. Dónde - Where			
4. Nuestro - Our			
5. Used - You			
6. Quién - Who			
7. Llantas - Tire			
8. Ella - She or her			
9. Cómo - How			
10. Nosotros - We or us			
11. Mamá - Mother			
12. Hija - Daughter			
13. Esposo - Husband			
14. Miércoles - Wednesday			
15. Martillo - Hammer			
16. Clavo - Nail			
17. Madera - Lumber			
18. Cabeza - Head			
19. Despacio - Slow			
20. Serrucho - Saw			
21. Escalera - Ladder			
22. Mecánico - Mechanic			

APPENDIX C

Sample Pages from the Paper/pencil Test Instrument

I. COMPREHENSION

Directions: Ahora quiero que usted me conteste con una frase en inglés, o en español para indicar que usted comprende lo que yo le digo.

Ejemplo: What is your name?
Response: My name is _____.

	2	1	0
1. Hello, how are you? Response: Fine, thank you.			
2. Do you have a driver's license? Response: Yes (no), I have (do not have) a driver's license.			
3. Do your eyes hurt? Response: No, my eyes do not hurt.			
4. Do you need a doctor? Response: No, I do not need a doctor.			
5. What is your address? Response: My address is _____.			
6. What day do we go to church? Response: We go to church on Sunday.			
7. Which are the work days? Response: Monday through Friday.			
8. How many hours do you work a day? Response: I work _____ hours a day.			
9. What time do you get home from work? Response: I get home from work at _____. .			
10. What day is today? Response: Today is _____.			
11. What does the carpenter use in his work? Response: The carpenter uses lumber (or tools, nails, etc.).			
12. Who delivers the mail? Response: The postman delivers the mail. . . .			

II. ENGLISH USAGE

Directions: Yo le voy a decir una frase en español. Escuche bien la frase y dígame lo que significa en inglés.

Ejemplo: Qué quiere decir, ¿Cómo se llama él?
Response; What is his name?

	2	1	0
1. ¿Como te llamas tú? Response: What is your name?			
2. El se llama Tomas. Response: His name is Tomás.			
3. Ellos se llaman Rosa y Tomás. Response: Their names are Rosa and Tomás. .			
4. Me duele la garganta. Response: My throat hurts.			
5. Deseo empleo. Response: I need employment (or, a job). . .			
6. ¿Cuánto cuesta? Response: How much does it cost?			
7. Necesito algunas cosas de la tienda. Response: I need some things from the store.			
8. ¿Qué hora es? Response: What time is it?			
9. Ayer fue un diá de trabajo. Response: Yesterday was a work day.			
10. Favor de cerrar la puerta. Response: Please close the door.			
11. Es el primero de septiembre. Response: It is the first of September. . .			
12. Este es un serrucho de carpintero. Response: This is a carpenter's saw.			
13. Tiene que lavar ropa Response: She has to wash clothes.			

III. VOCABULARY

Directions: Le voy a decir una palabra en español. Escuche bien y dígame la palabra en inglés.

Ejemplo: ¿Cómo se dice escalera en inglés?
Response: Ladder.

	2	1	0
1. Enfermera - nurse			
2. Doce - twelve			
3. Quince - fifteen			
4. Zapatos - shoes			
5. Garganta - throat			
6. Fiebre - fever			
7. Casa - home (house)			
8. Receta - prescription			
9. Botica - drug store			
10. Ojos - eyes			
11. Medicina - medicine			
12. Cinco dólares - five dollars			
13. Carne molida - ground meat			
14. Lechuga - lettuce			
15. Helado - ice cream			
16. Medio dia - noon			
17. Inglesia - church			
18. Domingo - Sunday			
19. Reloj despertador - alarm clock			
20. Viernes - Friday			
21. Muela - tooth			

ERIC Clearinghouse
AUG 20 1971
on Adult Education